



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY AND

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

Department of Agricultural Resources

**State Reclamation and  
Mosquito Control Board**

251 Causeway Street, Suite 500  
Boston, MA 02114-2151



**DEVAL L. PATRICK**  
Governor

**TIMOTHY MURRAY**  
Lt. Governor

Mark S. Buffone, Chairman  
*Department of Agricultural Resources*  
Anne Monnelly  
*Department of Conservation and Recreation*  
Glenn Haas  
*Department of Environmental Protection*

**IAN A. BOWLES**  
Secretary

**DOUGLAS W. PETERSEN**  
Commissioner

Alisha Bouchard  
*Project Administrator*  
Tel: (617) 626-1715  
Fax: (617) 626-1850

**STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD (SRMCB)**

**Subject: Summary Meeting Minutes**

**Date / Time:** Wednesday, January 16, 2008 @ 10:00 AM

**Place:** UMASS Eastern Extension Center  
240 Beaver Street, Waltham, MA

**Attendees:**

SRMCB Board: Mark Buffone, Department of Agricultural Resources /SRMCB, Chairman  
Glenn Haas, Department of Environmental Protection / SRMCB Member  
Anne Monnelly, Department of Conservation and Recreation / SRMCB Member  
Alisha Bouchard, SRMCB, Projects Administrator

**Mosquito Control Project Commissions:**

Richard Pollack, Mosquito Advisory Committee / Norfolk County MCP, Commissioner

**Mosquito Control Project Directors/Superintendents / Assistants:**

Walt Montgomery, Northeast MA Mosquito Control & Wetlands Management District  
Tim Deschamps, Central MA Mosquito Control Project  
David Henley, East Middlesex Mosquito Control Project  
John Smith, Norfolk County Mosquito Control Project  
Bruce Landers, Suffolk County Mosquito Control Project  
Jake Jurgenson, Berkshire County Mosquito Control Project  
Dave Lawson, Norfolk County Mosquito Control Project  
Jack Card, Northeast MA Mosquito Control & Wetlands Management District  
Tim McGlinchy, Central MA Mosquito Control Project  
Priscilla Matton, Bristol County Mosquito Control Project  
Ellen Bidlack, Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project  
Dan Daly, Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project  
Steve Burns, Bristol County Mosquito Control

Others: Martha Steele, Massachusetts Department of Public Health  
Suzanne Condon, Massachusetts Department of Public Health  
Heidi Ricci, Massachusetts Audubon  
Kimberly King, Vector Borne Corporation

**1.0: Call to Order, Attendance and Opening Remarks.**

- 1.1: Call to Order:** Chairman, Mark Buffone began the meeting welcoming everyone, officially opening the meeting at 10:11AM and stated that the meeting was being held at UMASS Eastern Extension Center, 240 Beaver Street in Waltham, MA. Also, he announced the meeting has been posted accordingly at both the Secretary of States office and the Executive Office of Administration and Finance pursuant to the Open Meeting Law.
- 1.2: Attendance:** The Chairman noted three members of the Board were present allowing for a quorum for voting purposes; each Board member was introduced. After acknowledging and thanking those in attendance the Chairman asked those in attendance to sign the attendance sheeting; noting that the Board would like to maintain the attendance sheet as part of the record.
- 1.3: Opening Remarks:** The meeting agenda was distributed while Chairman Buffone gave opening remarks thanking the Mosquito Control Projects (MCP) staff and Commissioners who attended the January 7<sup>th</sup> training at the Department of Fish and Wildlife's (DFW) headquarters in Westboro, MA. The training was coordinated with DFW's Dr. Tom French who the Chairman thanked for his attendance at today's meeting. The Chairman stated that the training session was very good and well received providing necessary clarity on how to proceed and comply with the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act and the current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed in July 2007 between the Department of Agricultural Resources (DAR) and DFW. It was further noted, that the MOU is a tool that brings all parties to the table to discuss mosquito control pesticide use and standard interventions in and around priority habitats.

In summary, as it relates to the interventions of mosquito control in these areas, generally standard activities of the MCP's have been given the green light in areas such as; monitoring, source reduction, larviciding, adulticiding and Open Water Marsh Management. There were no restrictions on monitoring to the use of Bti as it relates to Methoprene and no concerns with catch basin use; other uses would need to be reviewed in a shared review between DAR and DFW. DFW will provide maps of where Methoprene must be avoided; for example a state listed species of toad in Essex County as illustrated in the maps presentation by Dr. French during the training. At this point in time, there are generally no restrictions for truck-based adulticiding. Notification would be sent if there were vulnerable state listed species populations. There were some concerns regarding physical ditching relative to certain bird species egg laying and hibernating turtle activities.

While the training focused on some of the aforementioned activities a lot of attention was given to communication and implementation of any potential restrictions for 2009.

The Chairman noted his remarks herein were a quick overview of a very worthwhile effort and training. The Chairman went on to thank Tom and his staff for their work and expressed his continued hope to work with Tom and others to be sure we are all on the same page as it relates to the MA Endangered Species Act.

**2.0: Vote to Approve October 31, 2007 Minutes.**

**2.1: Background:** Chairman Buffone proceeded to agenda item #2 calling for the Board to vote to accept minutes / summary for meeting held on October 31, 2007.

**2.2: Questions and Discussions:** None.

**2.3: Action Taken:** Glenn Haas made a motion to approve the minutes as amended with correction to the March meeting date. Motion seconded by Anne Monnelly and voted unanimously to approve.

**3.0: Bureau of Environmental Health, Massachusetts Department of Public Health  
Community Specific Pesticide Application Information Request**

**3.1: Background:** Chairman Buffone stated that agenda item #3 was for the Board to consider a request by the Bureau of Environmental Health, Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH) for Community Specific Pesticide Application Information. The Chairman reported that in November 2007; the SRMCB received a letter from Suzanne Condon, Associate Commissioner and Director of the Bureau of Environmental Health, MDPH regarding a request received at MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health to review community specific pesticide applications conducted by Mosquito Control Projects throughout the course of any particular season.

Chairman Buffone, acknowledged the apparent concerns over potential health issues associated with those particular applications at the local level.

Suzanne Condon and Martha Steele both from the Department of Public Health were introduced by the Chairman and it was noted that our sister agency is looking for some information from the Board and the MCP's in terms of evaluating potential impacts. The Chairman asked Suzanne and others from her office to come today to present and explain their plans, their needs as to what they were requesting, what they expect to accomplish, provide further details and to clarify what is needed from this Board and the MCP's. Next, the Chairman turned the meeting over to MDPH for their presentation.

**3.2: MDPH Presentation:** Suzanne Condon, MDPH began by thanking the Board and then went on to say that MDPH was asked sometime back during the summer of 2006 aerial applications and then based on last years experience whether or not MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health had really taken a hard look at mosquito control practices across the state and could MDPH evaluate if there has been any kind of impact as a result of mosquito control activities.

Ms. Condon continued by saying that working with the Mosquito Control Districts is a good idea in terms of a collaborative process and that she is more concerned about places that don't have an organized mosquito control program. She noted in her observations over the last few years that there is a lot of discussion and clarity across the Districts as to who is doing what, what products are being used, how frequently they are used, etc as opposed to some areas in the state where we see there is either no organized program or where people have sought to find their own remedies.

Accordingly, MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health decided they would take a step wise approach to this study first finding out what data is available across the state. Having the organized MCP's allows MDPH to know who to communicate with and where to find out what kind of information might be available. MDPH - Bureau of Environmental Health will then look at that information in relation to what is happening across the state and in areas that don't have a more organized mosquito control program. Once MDPH finds out what data is available more routine products used will be looked at along with health indicators such as; central nervous system disorders or respiratory effects. This type of data is available through the Poison Control Office which MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health has contractual agreements with; MDPH would ask to look at the data and try to link them in a fashion that makes sense.

Ms. Condon went on to say, that MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health is several months away from getting to the point of looking at such data; it is going to take a lot of work to figure out what the landscape is in terms of mosquito control practices. For example, what types of products are used, at what concentration, at what frequency and length of time? These things along with seasonal activities need to be looked at because there will be an impact when looking at any type of health data. MDPH needs to get familiar with the landscape of data that is available; the purpose of this meeting is to explain what MDPH has been asked to evaluate, explain the kind of information MDPH believes would be important in helping to inform and to establish a clear need to collaborate.

Next, Ms. Condon articulated how MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health would come up with analyses so others would know in advance how MDPH will embark upon the analytic work so there are no surprises. "This offers an opportunity for people to voice their opinion and reasoning for what they believe may or may not work and/or to offer alternative ways of looking at data." And then she offered that there might be more of a seasonal comparison looking at different rates with different outcomes. "Obviously in the winter months in Massachusetts there are going to see more respiratory effects." Therefore, suggesting that there would be a need to control for respiratory illness as it is looked at during the summer months. These are all the types of things that need to be taken into context before embarking on a set of analyses but the primary purpose today is to lay out what MDPH believes has been asked to help address.

Ms. Condon concluded; MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health has no preconceived notions going forward, simply have been asked to help provide an evaluation of pesticide use across the state and whether not there have been any impacts to health as a result of it in a way that provides information that right now does not exist.

- 3.3: **Questions / Discussions:** An extensive discussion, with a number of questions and comments between meeting participants and MDPH- Bureau of Environmental Health pursued resulting in the following summary of highlights categorized below:

#### **Interested Parties**

Suzanne Condon, MDPH stated a number of people asked during the previous two seasons about mosquito control practices and who is evaluating on a statewide basis in terms of health. Massachusetts Audubon also asked along with enough other people that MDPH felt it was important to at least try to put forward a plan that would get closer to finding answers.

#### **Research, Referencing Other Studies**

A couple of the MCP's raised the question whether any kind of research to see if this study has been done elsewhere in the country would be looked at. It was noted that studies have been done by the CDC regarding adulticide use by nine states; this was a large article in the Environmental Health Perspective that talked about the actual impacts to people from mosquito control pesticides. Suzanne Condon, MDPH stated this would be done as part of the analytic protocol to be developed; we have to talk about what is used elsewhere, what they have seen, if they've done anything and how that fits with any potential hypothesis that we'd be generating.

#### **Private Applicators / Homeowners**

Multiple questions and issues were raised by MCP's and others relative to how MDPH is going to regulate, control data &/or include private applicators both commercial and homeowners that effect mosquito control and relative factors that indicate use of the same pesticides that may be also used by the MCP's. One concern is that private applicators don't follow an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program, and don't have the regulations and legislation that MCP's follow for mosquito control. The other concern is that the impact from homeowner applications should not be dismissed with out first being verified as to its significance.

In response, the MDPH indicated this study wouldn't be used to regulate but to highlight that there may be more problems in areas that don't have an organized system in place. Regardless of regulating, MDPH regularly issues advisories that many people pay attention too. Ms. Condon communicated that MDPH is proposing to look at what environmental data is available to see if there is enough consistency across the state to do meaningful analysis; if there were, MDPH would write up an analytic protocol on the kinds of data to be looked at.

#### **Misting Systems**

Chairman Buffone addressed the topic of Misting Systems by saying the Board in November 2005 approved a policy that does not recommend these misting systems we feel it is contrary to IPM that policy is on our web site. The policy is in line with American Mosquito Control Assoc policy on these systems. Still there are many things evolving in this area; we don't have regulatory authority over private companies. Just like the Pesticide Board, DAR doesn't have control over homeowners who want to use these systems. But we strongly advise against it; maybe this is an area where MDPH and SRMCB could partner; MDPH could look at SRMCB policy and give advice to the public i.e.: mosquito control people don't recommend it; MDPH could maybe piggy back on that and perhaps we can make some joint recommendations.

### **Mosquito Control Project Applicators**

Ms. Matton, BCMCP asked when MDPH looks over the landscape using the annual report; and sees use of product A put out X amount of gallons, etc. this would be county wide; are you looking for town wide? How are going to take into consideration that every town like Taunton where we put out 5,000 gallons of product, overlaid over an entire town; then you find a problem is you going to come to Bristol MCP to see if we were in that area?

Ms. Condon, MDPH predicted, this is going to be a long process; it is not something we can make sweeping statements about anything this early on. That is why we are hoping to embark on a long-term look at this in a way that has partnerships between our groups. We have a lot of work to do to find out about communities that are not in an organized district.

### **Communication, Information & Resources: Requests / Access / Distribution**

Much of the meeting involved discussions regarding information and resources; specifically requests for information, accessing information & resources and distribution of information.

Chairman Buffone affirmed, whether DPH is looking for environmental groups or for a number of other people; what types of products are used, what time of year, frequency, etc., at a minimum that is all going to be put in the annual reports. These reports will be posted on our web site; so that the public will have access to look at each one of these nine reports and see exactly what's used, when it is used, those kinds of questions that have come over the years. The Chairman highlighted the following:

- Some of the questions MDPH has may be satisfied with the annual operations reports that will be voted on by the Board today and submitted on an annual basis from the MCP's.
- Utilization of the state liaison for pesticides at the DAR would be helpful in researching information whereas, records are kept for 3 years on all applicators for Pesticide Use Reporting.

Ms. Condon, noted another resource is Hospital Discharge Data; which is available to MDPH and can tell on a daily basis; discharge information. If MDPH, knew there were certain periods of time that were consistent across large areas where different types of applications were made that data could be linked to the hospital discharge data for respiratory effects or central nervous system effects. This is the kind of situation that would be written up in an analytic protocol before MDPH would even embark looking at the data; that way you reduce the opportunity for findings that really have no public health value.

Chairman Buffone, provided a follow up to a question about the SRMCB Questionnaire sent to Massachusetts's communities a couple years ago to survey whether or not they do any kind of mosquito control. Mr. Buffone explained that the Board, technically is supposed to approve any non-member communities that does any kind of mosquito control. A couple years ago the Board did a survey of the 168 municipalities that are not involved in any organized or established mosquito control. Of the 168 we had approximately 20 municipalities that had some kind of ongoing mosquito program. Many of the 20 municipalities only do catch basin treatments with either Methoprene or Bti type products for Culex species control.

- Continuing, the SRMCB did receive responses from most of the 168. With additional staff this would be an area to prioritize because what the Board wants to do is formerly approve or not approve those programs and actually approve with conditions.

On the subject area of this study Chairman Buffone, confirmed, MDPH will be concentrating solely on adulticide because it is relative to pesticide exposure to the general population and seeing if there are patterns or trends of like asthma; looking at the number of people going to the emergency ward complaining of respiratory illnesses and things like that. The Chairman continued by saying the way I look at this is; DPH is our sister agency we are obligated to try and cooperate as much as possible; I really don't have any objections. I see the districts already have this information through the pesticide bureau, DAR and through our annual reporting process which if the board votes on this annual operating report the 2008 would be due March 15<sup>th</sup> which will have the data for 2007 as to at least what they use, what time of the season they use, what concentrations they use. Furthermore, you'll probably see our public health tools in terms of adulticiding are very few. It's mostly pyrethroid class of insecticide that they are using. So that will make it less complicated in of terms of a starting point.

Chairman Buffone, addressing back and forth conversations relative to accessing information said, "I think we are all kind of moving to the same end point. There is no doubt that MCP's continue to do a good job. The Board itself would like to see some of this information in a central area. Its already out there just pick out of the different areas it also allows the public to kind of compare. I don't see this as a significant issue; we'll work w/ the Districts on doing what we have to do to make this work."

The Chairman asked that through this process MDPH bring in the DAR toxicologist who acts as staff to the Pesticide Board subcommittee; responsible for the registration of all pesticide products that is legally available to be used. In addition, the Chairman asked if Rich Pollack, Chairman of the Board's Mosquito Advisory Board (MAG) would be willing and MAG to be brought into this issue because we have Jim Leach, Bureau of Toxicology for New York who would also be instrumental in some of the actual evaluation? Just to get those folks involved will take a little time, he said.

Mr. Haas further advised that to effectively utilize the Pesticide Bureau start with whatever information is readily available, this is the best approach given the lack of resources, and worry about what more information you need later. Also, there needs to be some processes and time available to get information.

On another note, Mr. Haas communicated that all the agencies are /have been struggling with how they make themselves more transparent, how to get more data or information on the web and we are working on that. The other thing this group has talked a lot about GIS and how to get everyone using it and user friendly. My comment to Heidi; "I think your right and we want to share this information with you but it does take time and money to pull stuff together; its not something we can just through up on a web site with out some kind of an explanation. So it is going to take us some time especially, when only have one person but we are working on it and we'll get there."

**3.3: Action Taken:** Glenn Haas made a motion and stated that the Board respects the concerns of, and will follow through as a sister agency to support the Bureau of Environmental Health/MDPH regarding community specific pesticide application information as requested.

In addition, Glenn asked the Mosquito Control Projects to assist the Board in gathering data, highlighting the fact that this Board is very short handed. Glenn continued by recognizing the sooner information gets out before the next mosquito season starts the greater the chance the Projects will have some time, to help pull data together.

Motion seconded by Mark Buffone and voted unanimously to approve.

**4.0 Vote to Approve: Mosquito Control Generic Annual Operations Report Template  
Date of Submission**

- 4.1 Background:** Chairman Mark Buffone, advanced to the next agenda item #4; where the Board will consider a vote to approve the Mosquito Control Generic Annual Operations Report template and a date of submission for that information. The Chairman, proceeded to explain that; at the end of November last year, he asked Tim Deschamps to lead a workgroup for the purpose of developing a generic format for a operations plan or report that each Mosquito Control Project would complete and send to the Board on an annual basis. He also sent to Tim's attention in an email attachment a preliminary example of what he thought we might be able to do. Tim, graciously accepted the task along with a few other folks including: Glenn Haas, Heidi Ricci, Kimberly King and Alisha Bouchard. This group of people made up a workgroup, along with others for input on this report. The Chairman went on to thank and compliment the workgroup and others for their contributions to this effort. Furthermore, Chairman Buffone explained what the Board was looking for in this report; including, a description of what MCP's do and why, where and how MCP's conduct their activities and why. After providing examples, of the types of mosquito control activities MCP's may do and questions to be answered in the reporting the Chairman explained that other areas the report will include descriptions of personnel, trucks, equipment, overview of the geographic area and questions relative to seasonal activities.

The Chairman highlighted purposes for the reporting including more transparency, as with other state agencies, as well as, the aspect of accountability using public funds. Last of all, to address some concerns others have expressed in wanting to know more about what Mosquito Control Projects are doing.

The Board wants an electronic version of the reporting and wants to post it on the Reclamation Board's web site. Finally, SRMCB wants the reporting submitted by a certain date before MCP's get into their busy season; March 15<sup>th</sup> was the suggested target date for submission.

Next, Chairman Buffone before turning the meeting over to the workgroup leader, Superintendent Tim Deschamps for his comments and distribution of the report template along with the opportunity for other workgroup member's comments; the Chairman noted one of the objectives today is to have the Board vote on this document with or without amendments. The Chairman also stated "By no means is this the end all, cure all it will probably evolve over time and perhaps the workgroup itself can stay connected somehow or there could be a larger workgroup to refine it over time and probably each year re-visit it to see if there needs to be any refinements."

Tim Deschamps, Supt. CM MCP: Started by thanking the workgroup and others for their comments, insight and Mark for the template. Superintendent Deschamps reviewed the workgroups process for further developing the document, its details and subject matter. He also, noted one area the workgroup was unable to finalize was Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and exactly what is the definition; this illustrated



the need for further discussions on this topic. Next, Tim described how various activities and types of information were identified for inclusion in the report such as; GIS Maps of pesticide application areas, larval mosquito habitats, and frequency of adulticide requests and maps of storm water systems that could possibly breed mosquitoes and how could the effects of activities be measured in whole. In Tim's final comments he mentioned that this was a good start but that the document will have to evolve over the next few years.

#### **4.2 Questions / Discussions**

In general, other workgroup members gave their thanks and compliments; Chairman Buffone and Superintendent Deschamps also noted their appreciation and thanks to the MCP Directors and other participants in this process.

Following some minor discussions relative to the technical nature of the reporting documents;

Chairman Buffone stated there would be a link on the SRMCB web site for Annual Reports inclusive of a summarization for the public. "Eventually, some of these things will go through the MEPA special review process; right now we are taking a step-by-step approach with MEPA where the first step was the BMP; our priority is with the GEIR obligations but at some point these kinds of things and updates will go. In the interim we will put some kind of qualifier letting the public know we welcome any kind of suggestion or comments relative to what they are reading or seeing." Furthermore, Chairman Buffone will check to see if text box can be made available on the web site where people can make comments. "This way Alisha and I can monitor who is actually commenting, what their comments are and try to respond to them." While we may not be able to provide a satisfactory answer to some comments we can at least respond, and welcome public input in that respect until we can get things through the MEPA process and as Glen said its going to take some time.

The Chairman said he would talk with some ITD people to see if in this reporting format there is a way to pull pieces of information together from MCP's annual reports so that we can provide an overall summarization. Again, this will take some time; the objective here is to first get the Board's approval and to get the districts to submit the reporting information so that the 2008 information will reflect what happened in 2007.

Mr. Haas, included that he want to thank everybody and "let's call this Phase 1 - we are done with Phase 1; and when we need to make changes we'll do that as part of Phase 2." Mr. Haas also expressed his interest in wanting to hear back from the districts, "it's one thing to make out a form its another to fill it out" - "would like to hear back from the districts was it hard to fill out, easy, better way to do something - I don't particularly want to make this a form to fill out for the sake of filling it out and if there is ways we can make it easier, that would be helpful. Also, there may be information in here that we could set up in the future so that some of this would be pre-populated for you; so you only have to fill out what changed from last year so you don't have to go through that all the time that is probably easier to do than some of the other stuff. Anyhow, I'd be really interested to see now that we have a form what's it like to fill out."

Bruce Landers, Supt. SCMCP: Replied, "One of the problems with listing pesticides is the more times you list the product the more it seems like your using a lot of it. So if your using 100% insecticide your going to end up w/ less volume whereas, when you use larvicide you might be using an awful lot of liquid so your get you a lot of gallons on some insecticides or, if

your using granular you get a lot weight but you don't necessarily have a lot of insecticide; aren't you better off giving pounds per some."

As a result, of a lengthy discussion about how to calculate various pesticide products for reporting purposes the following conclusions were drawn;

Chairman Buffone suggested, we make it total; where you could put total amount of concentrate per labeling but then put total gallons or total briquettes; maybe list boxes where you could put the aforementioned. What we want is gallons, pounds, even with briquettes; with my West Nile virus use reports ask cities and towns to calculate it out; so if they, use 1,300 briquettes divide it by # of grams and multiply it to get the pounds because; that is what you are interested in.

Bruce Landers, Supt. SCMCP: Asked, "What about report it by the number of bags you use?"

Chairman Buffone: Stated, "If you are using 100 pounds of Bti; just report it as a 100 pounds; there is room in here to qualify its 10% Bti whatever. That's the key w/ IPM; I know there is a lot of definitions (this is addressed to Heidi as well on IPM) there is EPA definitions, there is state definitions, every state has its own definition of IPM and generally it talks about monitoring, combination or holistic approach which folks are doing; identification of the pests, actual of determination of absence/ presence of the pests but then it talks about sometimes the use of low risk products; it may or may not talk about reduction of pesticides and it may also mean more pesticides. I brought up this example before that if the districts curtail their adulticiding activities and get more suave and go more to larviciding well the BTI poundage is going to go up so that necessarily isn't a bad thing its just that with IPM they are focusing on not only the pesticide itself but the conditions and the conditions of one year might be different than another; it may be worse weather wise where they might be using more product and so IPM is flexible in that situation. My definition of IPM is real simple it just means you don't solely rely on pesticides and that's really what it comes down to along with identifying the pests itself and the conditions that make the pests present."

Ms. Ricci replied, "Then I think the whole discussion about IPM definition is more on a policy level as opposed to an annual reporting form. My concern with definitions is that, my understanding, is that Massachusetts Pesticide Control Act definition applied to all the agencies and programs.

Chairman Buffone said, "It really only applies to schools; in fact if you look at our vegetation management regulations..."

Ms. Ricci, "But if the districts are concerned about complying with the Children and Families Protection Act (CPA) does it apply there? And I also thought that there was broader, maybe its not in statue but an Executive Order, but I recall something a few years ago..."

Chairman Buffone answered, "That's relative to state buildings, IPM in state buildings. So you have three separate things. You have IPM in schools, state buildings and IPM in vegetation management control where actually has its own definitions. So again, IPM it's a philosophy, an approach, or strategy. There are a lot of words you can use to describe it maybe for this purpose we don't necessary need a definition for this. Because one of the obligations of the Reclamation Board is we are going to talk about IPM as we send it off to MEPA; we are going to have to come up with a document that basically describes what you folks do in terms of IPM and we'll probably come up with some kind of joint definition. But what I would like to see is it more curtailed to the actual practice of mosquito control.

Because that's really what I think the public would want to see in terms of a definition.

Ms. Ricci, "It includes source reduction; it includes opportunities to include stream habitat so that it's not all stagnant from all the sand that's collecting and restrictions from culverts and things it goes beyond pesticides whether you call it IPM or IMM."

Chairman Buffone "Well we are going to call it IPM; because the feedback I receives from these folks they don't use the acronym IMM. So I haven't changed it on the web site yet. Anyways, I think we've discussed it unless someone has a significant revelation."

- 4.3 **Action Taken:** Glenn Haas made a motion to approve the Annual Operations Report template and stated that the Chairman of the Board should send out a letter to the Commissioners notifying them of this vote, officially giving them the Annual Operations Report form and notification of date deadline for submitting reports to the Board.

Motion seconded by Anne Monnelly and voted unanimously to approve.

## 5.0 Other Business / Announcements:

### 5.1 Commissioner Interviews:

For Commissioners whose term(s) expired November 30, 2007.

Chairman Buffone: Stated, "Over the next few weeks / months the Board has to schedule interviews for commissioners coming up for re-appointment. We did interview two commissioners but we still have a number to do; so we aren't done with that."

### 5.2 Administrative Update

Chairman Buffone: Began by updating on the status of the temporary moratorium; "No changes in the temporary moratorium on salary and COLA increases. Things are still status quo we have the Human Resources Department looking at job descriptions; Alisha and Mary Beth are working with HRD to try and re-classify all the titles so we have some equity throughout the landscape."

Following the Chairman's update on this issue a very long discussion continued with various issues summarized below:

The Board was asked if they would entertain a motion to put some type of cap in place such as; a 3% or cannot exceed 2% for salary increases. Chairman Buffone, answered to this request by saying the Board could consider putting it on the table. However, there are issues that need to be taken into consideration including: the status of reclassification, significant fringe benefit increases and GIC costs. In addition, DOR is monitoring individual assessments with particular concern whereas cities and towns are going through difficult financial times. Therefore, the Board has to proceed cautiously given these factors and the cities and towns option to withdraw.

Mr. Haas indicated that the Board could look across the state and find out what the average percentage of a pay raise is whether 2% - 3% and figure out a number the Board could consider for use as a flat rate for salary adjustments. Mr. Haas went on to say, "And at least we can budget for that maybe we'll have answer before the budget has to come through; but there will be a number to budget for. I think that's fair its been

going on for a year and I think we just need to have a number we can fall back on that says where'd you get that number from it's a reasonable number it can be nine different choices of what they want to use well have to come up with our own number based on what is going on around the state."

Chairman Buffone followed up with, that will be something that will be discussed and that he will check with Human Resources on this idea that we have a moratorium in effect but not necessarily ruling out adjustments for salary increases for FY2009 budgeting. And, not to rule out some kind of a percent increase based on fairness and equity for all employees of all districts; an across the board type of adjustment."

In summary, administrative business concluded with multiple discussions between the Board and the Districts regarding regional commissioner meetings, recognition of two sets of operating policies, areas of standardization (procurement and Human Resources), the undertaking and process of re-classification and the joint struggle shared by Commissions and everyone involved to try and resolve a variety of issues while working together in a respectful, cohesive manner.

- 5.4      **Next Meeting Dates:**  
   May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2008  
   October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008  
   Board meetings fall on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the month stated above.
- 6.0:      **Adjournment.**
- 6.1:      Background: The Chairman asked if there were any other comments or questions before the Board officially adjourns the meeting.
- 6.2:      Questions and Discussions: None.
- 6.3:      Action Taken: Glenn Haas made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:11 PM. The motion was seconded by Anne Monnelly and voted unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark S. Buffone  
Chairman